

ON THE PAPER " THE LEPIDOPTERA NAMES OF DENIS &  
SCHIFFERMÜLLER- A CASE FOR STABILITY" BY K.SATTLER  
AND W.G.TREMEWAN IN 1984

In the recent issue of Nota lepidopterologica(vol.7(3):  
282-285,30.ix.1984),a paper written by SATTLER and TREMEWAN entitled "  
"The Lepidoptera names of DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER-a case for stability"  
was published.

Although I feel confident that it would not stimulate  
the common sense of the persons,who support the article by SATTLER  
and TREMEWAN in question,I take up my pen to write this note,as I  
would like to mention my opinions on various points regarding this  
article,which bear the suggestion of an undervaluing of my work,  
and also,to make known the real reason for some baseless,unfair  
attitude and accusation against me.

Today,taxonomical status of a great number of species  
and genera described in the order Lepidoptera are still uncertain.  
This case is also valid for many specific and generic names used.  
Among the recent publications on Lepidoptera , it is not difficult  
to find very many names proposed as synonyms,homonyms,or in other  
new combinations,because of their incorrect taxonomic position or  
nomenclatural usage. Such process in the taxonomic researches of  
alpha-level is quiet natural. SATTLER,TREMEWAN,and their friends,  
and also many other lepidopterists in the world,study on various  
subjects of alpha-taxonomy,using the same methods,following the  
same International Code on Zoological Nomenclature. I have also  
been studying on alpha-taxonomy.

A taxonomist should study not only on the classification,  
but also,if present,on the nomenclatural problems of animal groups.  
And he,by doing this,has an obligation to explain his opinions and  
investigations based on scientific methods.

As to my research program,like many other taxonomists,  
I have been studying on the taxonomy and nomenclature of various  
groups. I hope,or so far as I know,whoever wishes to study in this  
branch of science does not need to have a permission.Any subject  
in taxonomy or nomenclature is restricted to the favour few.

Priamus 4(1/2).3-12.

1986

Every scientist should respect opinions of each other. The lesson to be drawn from history is that "science as a structure grows by a struggle for survival among ideas". There are astonishing processes at work which in time make pure the meanings even of at the beginning confused concepts.

Within the frame of my research program, two years ago, I have began to study on the validity of the specific names proposed by DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER in 1775. Because some of the names appeared in this work have been treated by various authors in the past as unavailable under the Code. This interpretation has been used by the following authors in their publications:

STAUDINGER & REBEL(1901), T.B.FLETCHER(1939, 1954), BERNARDI (1949 et seq.), LEMPKE(1953, etc.), PACLT(1953), OBRAZTSOV (1955, et seq.), VIIDALEPP(1976, et seq.), FERGUSON(1978), TREMEWAN(corresp., 1979)

This meant that DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER's names were not stabile, as their validity were in suspense.

By considering this situation, I found that DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER's names need a revisional study from nomenclatural standpoint.

In my work <sup>1</sup> (three parts hitherto published) I ascertained the correct status of totally 600 DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER's names. The results may be summarized as follows:

In the first part, 171 names are examined. Among them, 85 names are found to be available, and 86 names are unavailable under the Code. 52 names among unavailable ones are replaced by the next available synonyms in each taxa related. According to this, the valid names of 35 species remain as of old, only their authorships and dates are changed. 17 specific names are replaced by junior available synonyms.

---

1) Kocak, A.Ö., 1982-1984, On the validity of the species group names proposed by DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER, 1775 in Ankündigung (sic!) eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend. - Priamus 2:5-42(1982); 3:98-130, 133-154(1984).

In the second part, 245 names are examined. Among them 77 names are found to be unavailable, 168 are available under the Code. Among unavailable ones, 54 names are invalidated. As a result of this, the names of 33 species remain as of old, only their authorships and dates are changed. Among 21 species, 3 names are replaced by their senior synonyms. These are: Ectropis similaria HUFNAGEL, 1767, Epione vespertaria LINNAEUS, 1767, and Eupithecia signata SCOPOLI, 1763. The remains, 18 names, are replaced by junior available synonyms.

In the third part, 184 names are examined. Among them 18 names are found to be unavailable, 166 names are available under the Code. Among unavailable ones, the names of 5 species remain as of old, only their authorships and dates are changed. 5 specific names are replaced by junior available synonyms.

As a result of this survey, totally 600 names are studied. 419 names are recorded as available and 181 names as unavailable under the Code. Today, a great number of DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER's names are currently used as invalid. In this work only 116 names are invalidated, as they are unavailable. As a result of this, the names of 73 species remain as of old, only their authorships and dates are changed. On the other hand, 43 specific names are replaced by other junior available synonyms. Apart from this, 11 names proposed by DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER are first established as valid.

This work is the only comprehensive study, ascertaining the status of the species group names proposed by DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER. It has been done according to the rules of nomenclature. Its conclusions is therefore testable. Looking into roughly, it might be thought as simple job, but in fact a great effort is hidden behind it. Perhaps it needs some minor corrections, but there is no denying that it, even today, contributes an improvement of lepidopterology.

In their paper, SATTler and TREMEWAN wrote that the names published by DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER have been argued by some researchers as nomina nuda under the Code, but most of them have always been treated available. They also added:

" after 200 years of uninterrupted use it is clearly interest of stability to continue this practice. In two recent publications KOCAK (1982-1984) and von MENTZER (1984) query, from different aspects, the status of certain DENIS & SCHIFFER-MÜLLER names. If their views are accepted, a large number of established names or at least their authorships would have to be changed, thus affecting some of the commonest and best known European moths "

In the recent decades, many authors cited above felt doubt about the validity of the names given by DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER; therefore it cannot be considered that these names are used for 200 years uninterruptedly. To define them as "established" is simply an exaggerated statement. Furthermore, their claims are far from to be scientific, which only cause a factitious enthusiasm.

"The object of the Code, according to its Preamble, is to promote stability and universality of scientific names of animals. It follows from this that the provisions of the Code should be interpreted in favour of stability. We consider KOCAK's interpretation of Article 12 and 16 to be unnecessarily restrictive and his conclusions to conflict with the interest of stability "

My conclusions are wholly based upon the Rules of Nomenclature. From the foregoing paragraphs it is seen that they are too correct; therefore, a discrepancy between my conclusions and modified data used currently is quiet natural.

"...It follows from this that the provisions of the Code should be interpreted in favour of stability..."

Whoever reads the lines above, comes easily to conclusion that SATTLER, TREMEWAN and their friends are "guardian angels", securing the stability and the universality of all names in Lepidoptera.

How secure these gentlemen the stability in nomenclature,

let us see in the following paragraphs:

TREMEWAN, for my part, wisely prefer to ignore the correct status of infrasubspecific names in his papers. These modified data presented by TREMEWAN<sup>2</sup> may produce some misconceptions among the younger genuine taxonomists. TREMEWAN must conform to the rules of zoological nomenclature. The contrast view would lead us into a state of confusion.

SATTLER<sup>3</sup> resurrected BILLBERG's name, Athrips, after 158 years, by causing 11 new synonyms and 49 new combinations. He also stated:

"...its replacement by Athrips does not cause any nomenclatural instability".

As a matter of fact, I support such treatment, but I am under the impression that, if I myself made so many changes in the nomenclature after 158 years, I might be lost in the confusion. Athrips should be treated as nomen oblitum under the Code.

SATTLER<sup>4,5</sup> must also conform to the rules of zoological nomenclature, when he attempts to study on the type-designations of the genus names. Some of his designations does not fulfil the provisions of Article 68(a)(i), etc. of the Code.

NYE and his friends, in their recent publications on the genera of Lepidoptera of the world, proposed more than 100 new replacement names instead of many old, well-known and established names. They used generally odd replacement names, which contribute nothing to the advancement of science. The following anagrams are the examples to this:

- 
- 2) This case was partly introduced by KOCAK (1984, Priamus 3(4): 156 (note).
  - 3) SATTLER, 1978, Dt. ent. Z., n. f. 25: 57-61.
  - 4) "In the second volume of Microlepidoptera Palaearctica", which is considered by some authors as "Bible of Microlepidopterology", Dr. SATTLER (1967: 37) regarded STEPHENS's (1834: 241) restriction of the species Erminea dodocea HAWORTH in the genus Psecadia HÜBNER, 1825 as valid type-designation, though there was no designation at this reference" (KOCAK, 1982, Communs Fac. Sci. Univ. Ankara 25(C3): 21).



<u>old names</u>	<u>replacement names</u>
Jorgensenia SCHAUSS, 1924	Geriojennsa WATSON
Mardara WALKER, 1865	Ramadra NYE
Phara WALKER, 1854	Aphra WATSON
Sarapus WALKER, 1855	Asparus WATSON
Tricholepis HAMPSON, 1891	Chiretolpis WATSON
Calosoma GEYER, 1832	Osmacola WATSON
Acutia KAYE, 1919	Atucia WATSON
Alope WALKER, 1855	Olepa WATSON
Cymella FELDER, 1874	Myclela WATSON
Pachylepis FELDER, 1874	Yepcalphis NYE
Pagetia PROUT, 1922	Tegiapa NYE
Pangraptica HAMPSON, 1910	Craptignapa NYE
Paromia SCHAUSS, 1913	Ramopia NYE
Phasis WALKER, 1854	Shapis NYE
Platydia GUENEE, 1854	Yidalpta NYE
Pseudosmia KÖHLER, 1952	Despumosia NYE
Rhynchos GUENEE, 1852	Hondryches NYE
Harmatelia MOORE, 1882	Itmaharela NYE
Micropia HAMPSON, 1908	Pricomia NYE , and so on.

Take them, use them and don't ask any question about them !

Let us read again the following lines by SATTLER and

TREMEWAN:

"...the provisions of the Code should be interpreted in favour of stability"

It may be easily seen from the foregoing examples that there is a considerable discrepancy between their deeds and statements regarding to the universality and the stability of the names. In fact, for securing the foregoing names in their original forms, authorships and dates, proposals to the Commission should have been submitted by these esteemed scientists instead of playing with the names.

I scare that the problem between these gentlemen and me is more personal than a scientific one. Some serious errors appeared in the work " The Generic Names of Moths of the World" edited by NYE

and my love of Law and order impelled me to ascertain all the names published in this work from nomenclatural point of view.<sup>6</sup> Such monumental works, when published, must be entirely correct, so that the researchers may use them in the references without fear, or else, it will be farewell to all correctness and stability in nomenclature!

I have said above the accusations are more personal. This may be easily perceptible among the lines written by ROBINSON.<sup>7</sup> It runs:

"The synonymy introduced above for tunusensis underlines the inadvisability of introducing replacement names without undertaking taxonomic research: publications, such as those of KOÇAK, which are based solely on examination of limited literature serve only to confuse and obscure".

My paper was intended to be nomenclatural rather than taxonomical. It has also been prepared according to the rules of zoological nomenclature and based on sufficient literature. I was unfortunately ignorant of ZAGULYAEV's<sup>8</sup> publication on the same group, but I find this situation not so terrible. Such a critic against a simple synonym and its edition is nothing but rancour.

An other example to this is represented by TREMEWAN and NAUMANN.<sup>9</sup> This time they submit a proposal to the Commission for suppressing the specific name anthyllidis HÜBNER, 1819, which I found it as an available name in the family Zygaenidae, and used erebus MEIGEN, 1829 for a species, which is called as anthyllidis

- 6) KOÇAK, A.Ö., On the Nomenclature of Some Genera of Lepidoptera.- Priamus 1(3):98-109(1981), et seq.
- 7) Entomologist's Gaz. 33:175-180, 1982.
- 8) ZAGULYAEV, A.K., 1971, Ent.Obozr. 50:416-426(in russ.).
- 9) TREMEWAN & NAUMANN, 1984, Bull.zool.Nom. 41(2):73-76.

BOISDUVAL, 1829 wrongly (homonym of anthyllidis HÜBNER, 1819).<sup>10</sup>

Against to a simple synonym such an action is very expressive. On the other hand, it may also be regarded quiet natural, if this synonym is established by KOÇAK ! That's enough !

It is obvious that in the Continent the man who thinks differently, is more often despised than admired. Therefore, the most researchers<sup>11</sup> prefer to swallow the whole subjects. This may be regarded as an inoffensive way, and to live in the shadows of ignorance, far from any danger, is perhaps the best way for surviving in this branch of science.

Finally, I would like to write my opinion on the proposal offered by SATTler and TREMEWAN, regarding to the availability of the names proposed by DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER. They stated:

"DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER arranged the species in the form of a key and for botrana as a member of the Abtheilung Tortrices the following (translated) description applies: ... To this must be added the description of group E 'grey tortricid moth' and finally the host-plant of the larva 'grapes'. We believe that such a combined description fulfils the requirements of the Code and thus makes the name Tortrix botrana and all other similarly proposed DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER names nomenclaturally available".

Under this case, a special Article must be created and added to the present Code, in order to make this remarkable proposal available. If this was so, why did not NYE treat some HÜBNER's specific names to be available, published in Verz. bekannt. Schmett. similarly ? For example, two species exacta and erosa HBN. in the genus Anomia HBN.; two species ganqlico and interpuncta HBN. in the genus Athyra HBN, etc. This case was also discussed by Lempke (1953:94).

10) KOÇAK, 1982, Priamus 2(3):99.

11) They may be classified as "independent specialists" sensu NYE !



He stated : "...WARREN in his famous Monograph of the genus Erebia (1936, p.183) treats Papilio medusa Schiff., as a valid name. He forgets however, that the definition of the group is not part of the description of one species, but of a whole series of them. Every time the same definition has to serve as part of the description of another species. If we accept this as validating the name, then the consequence would be that, if an author fully defines a genus, and then gives a list of the new species belonging to it, only mentioning their name, these names would be valid. That is of course not the case, and for the same reason we must consider all names of group f' as nomina nuda.

It will be clear that only a strict application of art.25 can make an end to the instability in our Lepidoptera nomenclature as far as the SCHIFFER-MÜLLER names are concerned..."

The growth of scientific knowledge depends strictly upon the free opinions and investigations. It should not to be desired to strike fear in the heart of man and left him with a sense of helplessness.

Under all circumstances, I continue to struggle and to learn more about the mysteries in the lepidopterology.

#### L i t e r a t u r e :

Bernardi, G. et al., 1949 & seq., Liste de Grypocères et Rhopaloceres de la faune Française conforme aux Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature. - Revue fr. lépidopt. 11 & seq.

Denis, J.N.C.M. & Schiffermüller, I., 1775, Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend., Wien.

Ferguson, D.C., 1978, Noctuoidea, Lymantriidae, in Dominick, R.B., et al., The Moths of America North of Mexico, fasc.22(2):i-ix, 1-110 pp. pls. Fletcher, T.B., 1939, Names of Microlepidoptera (continued). - Entomologist's Rec. J.Var. 51:156-160.

Fletcher, D.S., 1954, On the Validity of the name Lobesia (Polychrosis) botrana (Schiffermüller). - Ent. Ber. 15:170-171.

Koçak, A.Ü., 1981-1983, On the nomenclature of some genera of Lepidoptera (continued). - Priamus 1(1):18-23, 1(3):97-109, 112-122; 2(4):157-164; 3(1):7-10.

Koçak, A.Ü., 1982, On the Criticisms made by Dr. I.W.B. Nye regarding my two recent papers published in this journal in 1980. - Communs Fac. Sci. Univ. Ankara 25:11-23.

Koçak, A.Ü., 1982-1984, On the validity of the species group names proposed by Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775 in Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend (continued). - Priamus 2(1):4-42; 3(3):98-130, 3(4):133-154.

Koçak, A.Ü., 1982-1983, Additions and Corrections to the Names Published in "Systematic and Synonymic List of the Lepidoptera of France, Belgium and Corsica" by Leraut, 1980. - Priamus 2(3):97-133, 2(4):137-157.

Koçak, A.Ü., 1984, More Additions and Corrections to the Names Published in "Systematic and Synonymic List of the Lepidoptera of France, Belgium and Corsica" by Leraut, 1980. - Priamus 3(4):155-168.

Lempke, J., 1953, The Schiffermüller Names. - Ent. Ber. 14:92-94.

Naumann, C.M. & Tremewan, W.G., 1984, *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval 1828 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation, Z.N.(S)2442. - Bull. zool. Nom. 41(2):73-76.

Nye, I.W.B., 1975, The Generic Names of Moths of the World, I. London.

Obraztsov, N.S., 1955, Die Gattungen der palaearctischen Tortricidae (Fortsetzung). - Tijdschr. Ent. 98:147-228.

Paclt, J., 1953, Proposed suspension of the Règles for two nomina nuda of Denis & Schiffermüller (Lep., Satyridae). - Ent. Ber. 14:91-92.

Paclt, J., 1953, Polychrosis vitisana (Jacq., 1788) comb.n. or new synonymy in an important pest of the grape-vine (Lepidoptera, Tortricidae). - Ent. Ber. 14:379.

Robinson, G.S., 1982, The Palaearctic Tineidae (Lepidoptera) described by Daniel Lucas. - Entomologist's Gaz. 33:175-180.

Sattler, K., 1967, Ethmiidae. in Amsel, H.G., et al., Micro-lepidoptera Palaearctica vol. 2, Wien.

Sattler, K., 1978, The Identity of the genus Athrips Billberg, 1820 (Lep., Gelechiidae). - Dt. ent. Z. (N.F.) 25:57-61.

Sattler, K. & Tremewan, W.G., 1984, The Lepidoptera names of Denis & Schiffermüller - a case for stability. - Nota lepid. 7:282-285.

Staudinger, O. & Rebel, H., 1901, Catalog der Lepidopteren des palaearctischer Faunengebietes. Berlin.

Viidalepp, J., 1976-1977, A List of Geometridae (Lepidoptera) of the USSR (continued). - Ent. Obozr. 54:842-852; 56:564-576.

Watson, A., Fletcher, D.S., Nye, I.W.B., 1980, The Generic Names of Moths of the World, 2. London.

Zagulyaev, A.K., 1971, Biological characteristic of moths of the subfamily Myrmecozelinae (Lepidoptera, Tineidae) and the description of new species (in russ.). - Ent. Obozr. 50:416-426, figs.